11/12/70

Dear Harold,

It has been quite some time since I could sit down to answer your letters, as well as those of others. Now, with about an hour to spare, I will attempt that chore. Again, please excuse brevity.

LHO Radio: I will ask the Archives for the info you request in my next letter to them. I noticed that a radio of Russian make is listed on the police inventory forms of the searches of LHO's Beckley room. Forget the exact reference now, but know it is in CE 2003.

Suits: Have gotten bits and pieces of news of developments, etc. but as of yet have no copies of recent things, including spectro. If needed I can have copies made.

Nichols: In a little note, you asked if in the gov't response to N's suit, his letter to A of 1/19/70 was attached, as theirs of 2/6/70 was included(as p. 23). I've checked my copy and the 1/19 is not in it. Also, I have received Nichols' supplementary brief in answer to gov'ts response. In a letter, N says he clearly prevailed in court, but judge asked for supp briefs. Nichols includes as one of the exhibits the Humes certificate--the WC copy and the one signed by Burkley.
He alse asked me if I know of anyone who asked to see the pix and X-rays while they were "in limbo" from April 26, 1965 to Oct. 29, 1966.

Rhoads Affid: In one letter, you indicate that you found much importance in this, as included in N's gov't response. You suggest that we read it tell you what we find. I do this hastily now...para 2-he admits not having spectro. Para 5 seems to contradict the A's failure to prepare new photos of the clothes for you...in the hastey reading, nothing really struck me.

The infamous Richard Kleindienst is coming to Penn to participate in a seminar on retentive detention. I'm sorry it's not a free form thing, for there are certainly some things I would like to ask that crusader for justice and human rights.

I will try to contact Clay as you request in your letter.

JFK Clothes: Is it true that the clothes were not in evidence before the WC? This seems rather unbelievable, considering the Humes test when they were introduced.

Z film: Your news of the film is extremely encouraging and exciting. I anxiously await seeing it somehow, possibly to test some ideas of my own.

Your letters to Paul re his more recent piece are good. I should be writing him today, and will enclose carbon.

This month's Atlantic magazine has an article on Hoover's t

tapping MLK's and RFK's phones. It does not appear to contain anything startling, but that is from a quick glance in a store. If you don't have, I can get for you.

A friend of mine recently wrote that, while staying in a hotel somewhere on the northeast coast (forget exactly where), he slept in a room which had "MM & RFK scratched on the bed-post. I found it interesting in light of what Dick had to say re Marylin Monroe and Bobby.

In our bookstore, a new volume just arrived, a staff report by the Commission on Causes and Prevention of Violence. This one is called "Assassination and Political Violence." I looked at its section on JFK, where it assures us there is no reason to recover the tedious path of the WC, and explains why LHO killed JFK. In its bibliography, it lists a book which I have not yet seen. It is by Stewart Brooks, called Our Murdered Presidents: The Medical Story, and includes a chapter on JFK. I managed to trace a copy to our law library, which currently cannot find it, but is looking. When I get it, I'll fill you in--unless you have already seen it.

This is to both you and Dick, re Paul:

In reading Paul's letter to Dick (10/29/70), I found two distrubing things. First, Paul asks Dick for the positive evidence he has that the rear head hit could not have been by a full jacketed bullet.

I believe I do not distort things to assert that I first noticed that evidence (the 6.5mm fragment in the entrance hole) and asked that it be kept confidential. I do perfectly understand that when we share so much information, especially so interrelated, we lose tract of sources, for I am guilty of this myself. However, I ask Dick not to go into any more detail with Paul about the significance of that fragment. This request is largely out of pride, for I XXXXXXXXX use this in my book, and think I deserve credit for it.

Secondly, and far more distressing to me, Paul speaks of "letters to Howard" which he has seen but of which he has no copies. He implies that the letters are Morgan's to me under an assumed name, re neck fragments. I dispensed copies of my panel mail to both of you with the explicit mention that these were to be kept confidential. I don't know how Paul could have seen these letters. I do not believe he was shown them deliberately behind my back, for I have too much faith in the only people to which I have sent copies. But, please, do not circulate any of that mail; it is to be kept strictly confidential. I see that even Newcomb got a copy of Paul's letter, and Lifton too is in on this. Those are people who I certainly don't want to get the notion that I8ve corresponded with the panel members. So please be careful.

Must go now.

Best,

Howard

cc. Dick